



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos.: 50-413/83-50 and 50-414/83-38

Licensee: Duke Power Company
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28242

Docket Nos.: 50-413 and 50-414

License Nos.: CPPR-116 and CPPR-117

Facility Name: Catawba 1 and 2

Inspection at Catawba site near Rock Hill, South Carolina

Inspectors: Virgil L. Brownlee for 12/29/83
P. H. Skinner Date Signed

Virgil L. Brownlee for 12/29/83
P. K. Van Doorn Date Signed

Approved by: Virgil L. Brownlee 12/29/83
Virgil L. Brownlee, Chief Date Signed
Project Section 2A
Division of Project and
Resident Programs

SUMMARY

Inspection on October 26 - November 30, 1983

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 247 inspector-hours on site in the areas of preoperational test program implementation, maintenance observation, preoperational testing of Unit 1, plant tours, and participation in licensing hearing.

Results

Of the five areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified in four areas; two violations were found in one area (Failure to provide adequate instrument calibration procedure, paragraph 7.a; and Failure to follow procedure for temporary modification, paragraph 7.b.)

8405300491 840502
PDR ADOCK 05000413
Q PDR

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

W. H. Bradley, Operations Quality Assurance
*J. W. Cox, Technical Services Superintendent
T. E. Crawford, Operations Engineer
C. W. Graves, Operations Superintendent
*J. W. Hampton, Station Manager
C. L. Hartzell, Licensing and Projects
*J. M. Stackley, IAE Support Engineer
W. R. McCollum, Performance Engineer
*T. E. Sanders, Mechanical I&C Design Engineer
G. T. Smith, Maintenance Superintendent
*P. G. Leroy, Licensing Engineer
M. S. Tuckman, Technical Services Superintendent (Transferred)

Other licensee employees contacted included construction craftsmen, technicians, operators, mechanics, and office personnel.

NRC Resident Inspector

P. H. Skinner

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on November 30, 1983, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Independent Inspection Effort (71302)

The inspector conducted tours of various plant areas. During these tours various plant conditions and activities were observed to determine that they were being performed in accordance with applicable requirements and procedures. No significant problems were identified during these tours and the various evolutions observed were being performed in accordance with applicable procedures.

6. Preoperational Test Program Implementation (70302) (Unit 1)

The inspector reviewed, in part, the implementation of the preoperational test program. Test program attributes inspected included review of administrative requirements, document control, documentation of major test events and deviations to procedures, operating practices, instrument calibrations, and correction of problems revealed by the test.

Specific activities reviewed included a partial review of the following test procedures:

TP/1/A/1100/01	Controlling Procedure for Hot Functional Testing
TP/1/A/1200/02B	Residual Heat Removal (Hot) Tests
IP/1/A/3231/01	Incore Thermocouple/RTD Cross Calibration
TP/1/A/1200/03E	NI Check Valve Test
TP/1/A/1550/01A	Diesel Generator 1A Fuel Oil System Cold Functional Test

The inspector also observed portions of the following preoperational test:

TP/1/A/1200/03E	NI Check Valve Test
TP/1/A/1250/05	Main Steam Safety Valve Setpoint Test
TP/1/A/1400/14A	Auxiliary Shutdown Panel Control Verification - A
TP/1/A/1350/09B	Diesel Generator B Load Sequencing Test

Based on this observation, no violations or deviations were identified.

7. Maintenance Observation

Station maintenance activities of selected systems and components were observed/reviewed to ascertain that they were conducted in accordance with requirements. The following items were considered during this review: the limiting conditions for operations were met, activities were accomplished using approved procedures, functional testing and/or calibrations were performed prior to returning components or systems to service; quality control records were maintained; activities were accomplished by qualified personnel; parts and materials used were properly certified; and radiological controls were implemented as required. Work requests were reviewed to determine status of outstanding jobs and to assure that priority is assigned to safety-related equipment maintenance which may affect system performance. As a result of this observation, two violations were verified as discussed in the following paragraphs.

a. Failure to Provide an Adequate Procedure

During review of procedure IP/O/A/3600/02, Calibration of Diesel Generator Fuel Oil Day Tank Level Switches (FD), dated 1-31-83, the inspector identified that the calibration procedure did not take into consideration unusable capacity contained in the bottom of this tank. This error would have allowed the fuel oil day tank at its low level setpoint to contain less fuel oil than the allowed Technical Specification requirement. This failure to provide an adequate procedure is a violation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V and section 17.2.5 of DUKE-1, Quality Assurance Program (50-413/83-50-01).

b. Failure to Follow Procedure

While reviewing maintenance activities being performed to support hot functional testing, the inspector identified that larger capacity fuses had been installed in pressurizer "C" heaters than the capacity specified by design drawings. Further investigation into this activity indicated that Station Directive (SD) 4.4.3, Temporary Station Modifications, defines the process required for this deviation. SD 4.4.3 requires an addendum be attached to the work request that installs a modification, to document the reason for the change and to identify any effects on system operations as a result of the modification. This is required to be approved prior to installation by designated individuals. Also, SD 4.4.3 requires the modification to be appropriately tagged, independently verified to insure the correct installation and that the operational control is notified. The inspector determined that the above requirements specified in SD 4.4.3 were not adhered to. This is identified as a violation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V and Section 17.2.5 of DUKE-1, Quality Assurance Program (50-413/83-50-02).

8. Participation In Licensing Hearings (94010) Units 1 & 2

The inspector (VanDoorn) participated in the operating license hearing process being held in Rock Hill, South Carolina.